

Existence Is Infinite

Moderators: AMod, iMod

Post Reply Search this topic… 731 posts 1 … 28 29 30 31 32 … 49

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Mon Jan 20, 2025 11:52 am

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 5:23 am
>
>> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sun Jan 19, 2025 3:33 pm
>>
>>> **Age** wrote: ↑ Sun Jan 19, 2025 1:25 pm
>>> ONCE AGAIN, the Universe, Itself, and Life, Itself, are infinite AND eternal. This has ALREADY BEEN PROVED True, and therefore can NOT be refuted.
>>
>> Where has this been proven true? How has this been proven true?
>
> In 'causality', or 'cause and effect'. It is IMPOSSIBLE for ANY thing to come FROM NO thing, or FROM nothing. Even you keep TELLING 'us' that 'nothing', 'nothingness', or 'no thing' does NOT even exist. Therefore, there WAS and IS ALWAYS some thing PRIOR, or BEFORE, EVERY other thing. Therefore, the Universe, which is ALIVE, and thus 'Life', Itself, and which is EXISTING, MEANS that the Universe, Itself, like Life, Itself, and like Existence, Itself, are eternal.
>
> For when one 'looks out', as far as one can SEE, it is IMPOSSIBLE for there to be ANY ACTUAL 'boundary' or 'edge' at ANY 'distance' AT ALL. In fact if one was to imagine a line between the most other perceived planets, stars, or other objects, then what is obviously between and around those objects is 'space', itself. Which;
>
> 1. Obviously does NOT have ANY 'edge' NOR 'boundary' to 'i't (besides of course the particles or objects of 'matter', themselves. So, forever extending IS 'space', itself.
>
> 2. Because light diminishes over distance, even if one could see the perceived the out most stars, planets, or other objects, then that is NOT known to be the 'edge' NOR 'boundary' of the Universe, Itself. The Universe IS therefore infinite, AS WELL AS eternal.
>
> And, because the 'Universe', Itself, is infinite, and ALIVE, and EXISTING, then so to is 'Life', Itself, AND 'Existence', Itself, ALSO infinite.
>
> Now, if these are NOT 'proof', to you, then WHY NOT, EXACTLY?

You claimed *life* is infinite. How does that prove life is infinite?

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 5:23 am
>
>> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sun Jan 19, 2025 3:33 pm
>> The limited term "universe" does not.
>
> Since when has the term 'Universe' EVER BEEN 'limited'. And, WHY do you SEE that term as BEING 'limited'.

Since the scientific community estimated the age of the universe to be approximately 13.8 billion years.

From this approximation one could argue the universe is indeed limited.

Existence encompasses the system known as our universe.

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 5:23 am
>
>> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sun Jan 19, 2025 3:33 pm
>>
>>> **Age** wrote: ↑ Sun Jan 19, 2025 1:25 pm
>>> A soda can, like EVERY thing ELSE is ALIVE, and LIVING, and therefore IS 'life'. you human beings tend to ONLY 'look at' and 'see' things from a VERY NARROWED perspective and so do NOT 'see' things for what they REALLY ARE.
>>
>> A soda can exhibits no vital signs or characteristics of a living organism.
>
> And, what are the, EXACTLY, so-called and so-claimed 'vital signs or characteristics of what is called A 'living organism?

Consumption, metabolism, growth, response to stimuli, reproduction, etcetera.

A soda can does not grow. A soda can does not respond to stimuli.

A soda can is not life. Life is not infinite.

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 5:23 am
>
>> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sun Jan 19, 2025 3:33 pm
>>
>>> **Age** wrote: ↑ Sun Jan 19, 2025 1:47 pm
>>> POINT TO, with words, or LIST, WHERE, EXACTLY, there IS 'space' that is 'physical' AND WHERE there IS 'space' that is NOT 'physical'.
>>
>> Physical space: an ocean. Immaterial space: outer space.
>
> Now, just so you BECOME AWARE, some might SAY and CLAIM that so-called 'outer space' IS 'physical'.

As stated at the top of the previous page this is philosophy, not physics.

The physics community, science generally views the universe as a physical system.

Philosophy is broader, more expansive. Philosophy has more depth. Philosophy embraces the immaterial not just the material or the physical.

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 5:23 am
> And, HOW FAR does one have to ACTUALLY TRAVEL TO REACH what you have called and labelled 'outer space', EXACTLY?

Just beyond Earth's atmosphere.

An ocean contains considerable amounts of atoms and molecules as contrasted with the vacuum of outer space.

An ocean, or at least part of one, can be touched and is obviously tangible. An ocean provides material resistance as it's densely arranged molecules and atoms.

The vacuum of outer space provides no resistance as it concerns minimal matter, minimal molecules and minimal atomic arrangements allowing material bodies motion.

Because of this the vacuum of outer space can be considered immaterial. However pure immaterial space would concern no atoms or molecules.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Age** » Tue Jan 21, 2025 12:27 am

Age
Posts: 26385
Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 11:52 am
>
>> **Age** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 5:23 am
>>
>>> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sun Jan 19, 2025 3:33 pm
>>>
>>> Where has this been proven true? How has this been proven true?
>>
>> In 'causality', or 'cause and effect'. It is IMPOSSIBLE for ANY thing to come FROM NO thing, or FROM nothing. Even you keep TELLING 'us' that 'nothing', 'nothingness', or 'no thing' does NOT even exist. Therefore, there WAS and IS ALWAYS some thing PRIOR, or BEFORE, EVERY other thing. Therefore, the Universe, which is ALIVE, and thus 'Life', Itself, and which is EXISTING, MEANS that the Universe, Itself, like Life, Itself, and like Existence, Itself, are eternal.
>>
>> For when one 'looks out', as far as one can SEE, it is IMPOSSIBLE for there to be ANY ACTUAL 'boundary' or 'edge' at ANY 'distance' AT ALL. In fact if one was to imagine a line between the most other perceived planets, stars, or other objects, then what is obviously between and around those objects is 'space', itself. Which;
>>
>> 1. Obviously does NOT have ANY 'edge' NOR 'boundary' to 'i't (besides of course the particles or objects of 'matter', themselves. So, forever extending IS 'space', itself.
>>
>> 2. Because light diminishes over distance, even if one could see the perceived the out most stars, planets, or other objects, then that is NOT known to be the 'edge' NOR 'boundary' of the Universe, Itself. The Universe IS therefore infinite, AS WELL AS eternal.
>>
>> And, because the 'Universe', Itself, is infinite, and ALIVE, and EXISTING, then so to is 'Life', Itself, AND 'Existence', Itself, ALSO infinite.
>>
>> Now, if these are NOT 'proof', to you, then WHY NOT, EXACTLY?
>
> You claimed *life* is infinite. How does that prove life is infinite?

But 'that', in and of itself, does NOT prove that life is infinite. Why did you presume or believe that 'that' did prove life is infinite.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 11:52 am
>
>> **Age** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 5:23 am
>>
>>> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sun Jan 19, 2025 3:33 pm
>>> The limited term "universe" does not.
>>
>> Since when has the term 'Universe' EVER BEEN 'limited'. And, WHY do you SEE that term as BEING 'limited'.
>
> Since the scientific community estimated the age of the universe to be approximately 13.8 billion years.

So, all it takes is just a few people only to ESTIMATE some thing, and then from then on that 'estimated thing' CHANGES the MEANING and USAGE of A word.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 11:52 am
> From this approximation one could argue the universe is indeed limited.

But one would have to be a COMPLETE and UTTER IDIOT and FOOL to just ACCEPT what only a few people have ESTIMATED, ONLY, as then being what IS ACTUALLY True, and Right.

LOL BELIEVING that one COULD ACTUALLY ARGUE some thing, like you are 'TRYING TO', here, from just an APPROXIMATION, ONLY, is NOT SHOWING MUCH WISDOM AT ALL.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 11:52 am
> Existence encompasses the system known as our universe.

you KEEP CLAIMING 'this'. However, what ACTUAL PROOF do you HAVE that the Universe, Itself, IS A 'system' WITHIN Existence, Itself?

OBVIOUSLY an ESTIMATION by just a FEW people is NOT PROOF, itself.

Also, and by the way, if the Universe was NOT EXISTING, then HOW could there even be 'Existence', Itself?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 11:52 am
>
>> **Age** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 5:23 am
>>
>>> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sun Jan 19, 2025 3:33 pm
>>>
>>> A soda can exhibits no vital signs or characteristics of a living organism.
>>
>> And, what are the, EXACTLY, so-called and so-claimed 'vital signs or characteristics of what is called A 'living organism?
>
> Consumption, metabolism, growth, response to stimuli, reproduction, etcetera.

So, EVERY thing that HAPPENS and OCCURS in A 'soda can'.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 11:52 am
> A soda can does not grow. A soda can does not respond to stimuli.

Obviously, you are, AGAIN, ONLY 'looking' FROM A VERY, VERY NARROWED perspective and field of view.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 11:52 am
> A soda can is not life. Life is not infinite.

If this is what you want to BELIEVE is ABSOLUTELY TRUE, then I am CERTAINLY NOT going to STOP you.

you CLAIMED that 'life is not infinite'.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 11:52 am
>
>> **Age** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 5:23 am
>>
>>> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sun Jan 19, 2025 3:33 pm
>>>
>>> Physical space: an ocean. Immaterial space: outer space.
>>
>> Now, just so you BECOME AWARE, some might SAY and CLAIM that so-called 'outer space' IS 'physical'.
>
> As stated at the top of the previous page this is philosophy, not physics.
>
> The physics community, science generally views the universe as a physical system.
>
> Philosophy is broader, more expansive. Philosophy has more depth. Philosophy embraces the immaterial not just the material or the physical.

LOL But you WANT TO USE 'physics' and the 'scientific community' WHEN you WANT TO CLAIM that the Universe is 'limited'.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 11:52 am
>
>> **Age** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 5:23 am
>> And, HOW FAR does one have to ACTUALLY TRAVEL TO REACH what you have called and labelled 'outer space', EXACTLY?
>
> Just beyond Earth's atmosphere.
>
> An ocean contains considerable amounts of atoms and molecules as contrasted with the vacuum of outer space.

Is there an ACTUAL 'vacuum of, so-called, outer space'?

Or, is this just what you WANT TO BELIEVE IS TRUE, ONLY?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 11:52 am
> An ocean, or at least part of one, can be touched and is obviously tangible. An ocean provides material resistance as it's densely arranged molecules and atoms.

you are REALLY BEING VERY, VERY SLOW, here.

The vacuum of outer space provides no resistance as it concerns minimal matter, minimal molecules and minimal atomic arrangements allowing material bodies motion.[/quote]

LOL So 'now' the so-called 'vacuum of outer space', which you CLAIM is 'immaterial' ACTUALLY DOES consist of 'matter', and thus is 'now' so-called 'material space'.

Are you AWARE of just HOW OFTEN you CONTRADICT "yourself", here?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 11:52 am
> Because of this the vacuum of outer space can be considered immaterial.

So, the so-called 'outer space', which you just admitted ACTUALLY DOES contain molecules, and thus matter, you want to call and CLAIM is 'immaterial space', BECAUSE you are just 'TRYING' your HARDEST to FIND 'the words' to FIGHT and ARGUE FOR the BELIEF that you 'currently' HAVE and are 'currently' HOLDING ONTO, here.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 11:52 am
> However pure immaterial space would concern no atoms or molecules.

So, are you ABLE TO INFORM the readers, here, of WHERE, EXACTLY, this place of 'immaterial space' IS, EXACTLY?

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Tue Jan 21, 2025 4:05 am

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 12:27 am
>
>> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 11:52 am
>> The vacuum of outer space provides no resistance as it concerns minimal matter, minimal molecules and minimal atomic arrangements allowing material bodies motion.
>
> LOL So 'now' the so-called 'vacuum of outer space', which you CLAIM is 'immaterial' ACTUALLY DOES consist of 'matter', and thus is 'now' so-called 'material space'.

The vacuum does not concern matter in the terrestrial sense. The vacuum concerns quantum fluctuations, radiation, virtual particles and sparingly atoms or molecules. While molecules are considered matter this is not the same as tangible, solid material.

Since dense atomic and molecular structures are absent the vacuum provides no material resistance allowing material bodies motion. Thus the vacuum of outer space is considered immaterial.

Compared with an ocean, which is obviously tangible and material, the vacuum of outer space is intangible and immaterial.

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 12:27 am
>
>> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 11:52 am
>> Because of this the vacuum of outer space can be considered immaterial.
>
> So, the so-called 'outer space', which you just admitted ACTUALLY DOES contain molecules, and thus matter, you want to call and CLAIM is 'immaterial space', BECAUSE you are just 'TRYING' your HARDEST to FIND 'the words' to FIGHT and ARGUE FOR the BELIEF that you 'currently' HAVE and are 'currently' HOLDING ONTO, here.

Relative to an ocean or a mountain range the vacuum of outer space is immaterial. With the vacuum molecules and atoms are sporadic and dispersed to such a degree that solid, palpable material is not formed.

Molecules are molecules, not the space among them. With the vacuum molecules are so sparse it can be considered immaterial. For explicative purposes the example works.

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 12:27 am
>
>> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 11:52 am
>> However pure immaterial space would concern no atoms or molecules.
>
> So, are you ABLE TO INFORM the readers, here, of WHERE, EXACTLY, this place of 'immaterial space' IS, EXACTLY?

Where matter isn't.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Age** » Tue Jan 21, 2025 5:26 am

Age
Posts: 26385
Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 11:52 am
>
>> **Age** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 5:23 am
>>
>>> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sun Jan 19, 2025 3:33 pm
>>>
>>> Where has this been proven true? How has this been proven true?
>>
>> In 'causality', or 'cause and effect'. It is IMPOSSIBLE for ANY thing to come FROM NO thing, or FROM nothing. Even you keep TELLING 'us' that 'nothing', 'nothingness', or 'no thing' does NOT even exist. Therefore, there WAS and IS ALWAYS some thing PRIOR, or BEFORE, EVERY other thing. Therefore, the Universe, which is ALIVE, and thus 'Life', Itself, and which is EXISTING, MEANS that the Universe, Itself, like Life, Itself, and like Existence, Itself, are eternal.
>>
>> For when one 'looks out', as far as one can SEE, it is IMPOSSIBLE for there to be ANY ACTUAL 'boundary' or 'edge' at ANY 'distance' AT ALL. In fact if one was to imagine a line between the most other perceived planets, stars, or other objects, then what is obviously between and around those objects is 'space', itself. Which;
>>
>> 1. Obviously does NOT have ANY 'edge' NOR 'boundary' to 'i't (besides of course the particles or objects of 'matter', themselves. So, forever extending IS 'space', itself.
>>
>> 2. Because light diminishes over distance, even if one could see the perceived the out most stars, planets, or other objects, then that is NOT known to be the 'edge' NOR 'boundary' of the Universe, Itself. The Universe IS therefore infinite, AS WELL AS eternal.
>>
>> And, because the 'Universe', Itself, is infinite, and ALIVE, and EXISTING, then so to is 'Life', Itself, AND 'Existence', Itself, ALSO infinite.
>>
>> Now, if these are NOT 'proof', to you, then WHY NOT, EXACTLY?
>
> You claimed *life* is infinite. How does that prove life is infinite?

But 'that', in and of itself, does NOT prove that life is infinite. Why did you presume or believe that 'that' did prove life is infinite.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 11:52 am
>
>> **Age** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 5:23 am
>>
>>> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sun Jan 19, 2025 3:33 pm
>>> The limited term "universe" does not.
>>
>> Since when has the term 'Universe' EVER BEEN 'limited'. And, WHY do you SEE that term as BEING 'limited'.
>
> Since the scientific community estimated the age of the universe to be approximately 13.8 billion years.

So, all it takes is just a few people only to ESTIMATE some thing, and then from then on that 'estimated thing' CHANGES the MEANING and USAGE of A word.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 11:52 am
> From this approximation one could argue the universe is indeed limited.

But one would have to be a COMPLETE and UTTER IDIOT and FOOL to just ACCEPT what only a few people have ESTIMATED, ONLY, as then being what IS ACTUALLY True, and Right.

LOL BELIEVING that one COULD ACTUALLY ARGUE some thing, like you are 'TRYING TO', here, from just an APPROXIMATION, ONLY, is NOT SHOWING MUCH WISDOM AT ALL.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 11:52 am
> Existence encompasses the system known as our universe.

you KEEP CLAIMING 'this'. However, what ACTUAL PROOF do you HAVE that the Universe, Itself, IS A 'system' WITHIN Existence, Itself?

OBVIOUSLY an ESTIMATION by just a FEW people is NOT PROOF, itself.

Also, and by the way, if the Universe was NOT EXISTING, then HOW could there even be 'Existence', Itself?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 11:52 am
>
>> **Age** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 5:23 am
>>
>>> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sun Jan 19, 2025 3:33 pm
>>>
>>> A soda can exhibits no vital signs or characteristics of a living organism.
>>
>> And, what are the, EXACTLY, so-called and so-claimed 'vital signs or characteristics of what is called A 'living organism?
>
> Consumption, metabolism, growth, response to stimuli, reproduction, etcetera.

So, EVERY thing that HAPPENS and OCCURS in A 'soda can'.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 11:52 am
> A soda can does not grow. A soda can does not respond to stimuli.

Obviously, you are, AGAIN, ONLY 'looking' FROM A VERY, VERY NARROWED perspective and field of view.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 11:52 am
> A soda can is not life. Life is not infinite.

If this is what you want to BELIEVE is ABSOLUTELY TRUE, then I am CERTAINLY NOT going to STOP you.

you CLAIMED that 'life is not infinite'.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 11:52 am
>
>> **Age** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 5:23 am
>>
>>> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sun Jan 19, 2025 3:33 pm
>>>
>>> Physical space: an ocean. Immaterial space: outer space.
>>
>> Now, just so you BECOME AWARE, some might SAY and CLAIM that so-called 'outer space' IS 'physical'.
>
> As stated at the top of the previous page this is philosophy, not physics.
>
> The physics community, science generally views the universe as a physical system.
>
> Philosophy is broader, more expansive. Philosophy has more depth. Philosophy embraces the immaterial not just the material or the physical.

LOL But you WANT TO USE 'physics' and the 'scientific community' WHEN you WANT TO CLAIM that the Universe is 'limited'.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 11:52 am
>
>> **Age** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 5:23 am
>> And, HOW FAR does one have to ACTUALLY TRAVEL TO REACH what you have called and labelled 'outer space', EXACTLY?
>
> Just beyond Earth's atmosphere.
>
> An ocean contains considerable amounts of atoms and molecules as contrasted with the vacuum of outer space.

Is there an ACTUAL 'vacuum of, so-called, outer space'?

Or, is this just what you WANT TO BELIEVE IS TRUE, ONLY?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 11:52 am
> An ocean, or at least part of one, can be touched and is obviously tangible. An ocean provides material resistance as it's densely arranged molecules and atoms.

you are REALLY BEING VERY, VERY SLOW, here.

The vacuum of outer space provides no resistance as it concerns minimal matter, minimal molecules and minimal atomic arrangements allowing material bodies motion.[/quote]

LOL So 'now' the so-called 'vacuum of outer space', which you CLAIM is 'immaterial' ACTUALLY DOES consist of 'matter', and thus is 'now' so-called 'material space'.

Are you AWARE of just HOW OFTEN you CONTRADICT "yourself", here?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 11:52 am
> Because of this the vacuum of outer space can be considered immaterial.

So, the so-called 'outer space', which you just admitted ACTUALLY DOES contain molecules, and thus matter, you want to call and CLAIM is 'immaterial space', BECAUSE you are just 'TRYING' your HARDEST to FIND 'the words' to FIGHT and ARGUE FOR the BELIEF that you 'currently' HAVE and are 'currently' HOLDING ONTO, here.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 11:52 am
> However pure immaterial space would concern no atoms or molecules.

So, are you ABLE TO INFORM the readers, here, of WHERE, EXACTLY, this place of 'immaterial space' IS, EXACTLY?

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Age** » Tue Jan 21, 2025 5:47 am

Age
Posts: 26385
Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 4:05 am
>
>> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 12:27 am
>>
>>> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 11:52 am
>>> The vacuum of outer space provides no resistance as it concerns minimal matter, minimal molecules and minimal atomic arrangements allowing material bodies motion.
>>
>> LOL So 'now' the so-called 'vacuum of outer space', which you CLAIM is 'immaterial' ACTUALLY DOES consist of 'matter', and thus is 'now' so-called 'material space'.
>
> The vacuum does not concern matter in the terrestrial sense. The vacuum concerns quantum fluctuations, radiation, virtual particles and sparingly atoms or molecules. While molecules are considered matter this is not the same as tangible, solid material.

Was it 'you' who informed 'us', previously, that so-called 'tangible, solid material' is made up of atoms, which themselves are made up of 'molecules'?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 4:05 am
> Since dense atomic and molecular structures are absent the vacuum provides no material resistance allowing material bodies motion. Thus the vacuum of outer space is considered immaterial.

Although the so-called 'vacuum of outer space' is, here, considered 'immaterial', or what you call 'immaterial space', the 'vacuum of outer space', STILL, consists of matter, molecules and atoms, just what you call 'minimal', correct?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 4:05 am
> Compared with an ocean, which is obviously tangible and material, the vacuum of outer space is intangible and immaterial.

Some people also say and claim that 'an ocean' is made up of water, whereas they would NOT say and claim that 'space', itself, is made of water.

Some people also say that 'an ocean' is NOT 'space' and say that 'space' is NOT 'an ocean'.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 4:05 am
>
>> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 12:27 am
>>
>>> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 11:52 am
>>> Because of this the vacuum of outer space can be considered immaterial.
>>
>> So, the so-called 'outer space', which you just admitted ACTUALLY DOES contain molecules, and thus matter, you want to call and CLAIM is 'immaterial space', BECAUSE you are just 'TRYING' your HARDEST to FIND 'the words' to FIGHT and ARGUE FOR the BELIEF that you 'currently' HAVE and are 'currently' HOLDING ONTO, here.
>
> Relative to an ocean or a mountain range the vacuum of outer space is immaterial.

Relative to a rock air could be perceived as 'immaterial', also.

So, what you are, REALLY, saying and CLAIMING, here, IS that what you refer to and call 'outer space', although containing matter, you, still, want to call 'it' 'immaterial space'.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 4:05 am
> With the vacuum molecules and atoms are sporadic and dispersed to such a degree that solid, palpable material is not formed.

HOW do you KNOW 'this' FOR SURE?

Have you STUDIED 'the vacuum'?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 4:05 am
> Molecules are molecules, not the space among them.

Just like 'the space' between and around 'molecules' is NOT the 'molecules' among 'space', itself.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 4:05 am
> With the vacuum molecules are so sparse it can be considered immaterial. For explicative purposes the example works.

With air molecules they are sparse, so it can be considered immaterial, AS WELL.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 4:05 am
>
>> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 12:27 am
>>
>>> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 20, 2025 11:52 am
>>> However pure immaterial space would concern no atoms or molecules.
>>
>> So, are you ABLE TO INFORM the readers, here, of WHERE, EXACTLY, this place of 'immaterial space' IS, EXACTLY?
>
> Where matter isn't.

But, and just TO CLARIFY, there IS 'matter' in what you call the 'vacuum of outer space', right?

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Tue Jan 21, 2025 1:08 pm

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 5:47 am
>
>> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 4:05 am
>>
>>> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 12:27 am
>>> LOL So 'now' the so-called 'vacuum of outer space', which you CLAIM is 'immaterial' ACTUALLY DOES consist of 'matter', and thus is 'now' so-called 'material space'.
>>
>> The vacuum does not concern matter in the terrestrial sense. The vacuum concerns quantum fluctuations, radiation, virtual particles and sparingly atoms or molecules. While molecules are considered matter this is not the same as tangible, solid material.
>
> Was it 'you' who informed 'us', previously, that so-called 'tangible, solid material' is made up of atoms, which themselves are made up of 'molecules'?

No. Molecules are comprised of atoms.

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 5:47 am
>
>> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 4:05 am
>> Compared with an ocean, which is obviously tangible and material, the vacuum of outer space is intangible and immaterial.
>
> Some people also say and claim that 'an ocean' is made up of water, whereas they would NOT say and claim that 'space', itself, is made of water.
>
> Some people also say that 'an ocean' is NOT 'space' and say that 'space' is NOT 'an ocean'.

Hence the terms physical space and immaterial space.

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 5:47 am
>
>> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 4:05 am
>> Since dense atomic and molecular structures are absent the vacuum provides no material resistance allowing material bodies motion. Thus the vacuum of outer space is considered immaterial.
>
> Although the so-called 'vacuum of outer space' is, here, considered 'immaterial', or what you call 'immaterial space', the 'vacuum of outer space', STILL, consists of matter, molecules and atoms, just what you call 'minimal', correct?
>
> …But, and just TO CLARIFY, there IS 'matter' in what you call the 'vacuum of outer space', right?

Again, the vacuum of outer space does not involve matter in the terrestrial sense.

Atoms and molecules constitute matter. However if there are insufficient amounts of atoms and molecules there isn't matter. That is the case with the vacuum of outer space.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Age** » Tue Jan 21, 2025 11:09 pm

Age
Posts: 26385
Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 1:08 pm
>
>> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 5:47 am
>>
>>> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 4:05 am
>>>
>>> The vacuum does not concern matter in the terrestrial sense. The vacuum concerns quantum fluctuations, radiation, virtual particles and sparingly atoms or molecules. While molecules are considered matter this is not the same as tangible, solid material.
>>
>> Was it 'you' who informed 'us', previously, that so-called 'tangible, solid material' is made up of atoms, which themselves are made up of 'molecules'?
>
> No. Molecules are comprised of atoms.

Okay, if you say so. Now, what are 'atoms' comprised of, EXACTLY?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 1:08 pm
>
>> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 5:47 am
>>
>>> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 4:05 am
>>> Compared with an ocean, which is obviously tangible and material, the vacuum of outer space is intangible and immaterial.
>>
>> Some people also say and claim that 'an ocean' is made up of water, whereas they would NOT say and claim that 'space', itself, is made of water.
>>
>> Some people also say that 'an ocean' is NOT 'space' and say that 'space' is NOT 'an ocean'.
>
> Hence the terms physical space and immaterial space.

Terms you SAY and USE, but WHEN you were QUESTIONED OVER those terms, of yours, you also CLAIMED that 'immaterial space' is actually composed of 'material', itself. Just less dense than, say, 'water'.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 1:08 pm
>
>> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 5:47 am
>>
>>> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 4:05 am
>>> Since dense atomic and molecular structures are absent the vacuum provides no material resistance allowing material bodies motion. Thus the vacuum of outer space is considered immaterial.
>>
>> Although the so-called 'vacuum of outer space' is, here, considered 'immaterial', or what you call 'immaterial space', the 'vacuum of outer space', STILL, consists of matter, molecules and atoms, just what you call 'minimal', correct?
>>
>> …But, and just TO CLARIFY, there IS 'matter' in what you call the 'vacuum of outer space', right?
>
> Again, the vacuum of outer space does not involve matter in the terrestrial sense.

OBVIOUSLY, and OF COURSE, HOWEVER you are ACTUALLY SAYING and STATING that what you CALLED 'vacuum of outer space', STILL, CONSISTS OF 'matter', itself, ANYWAY.

So, what you have been ESSENTIALLY SAYING and MEANING, here, is 'your term', 'immaterial space' consists of ACTUAL 'material'.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 1:08 pm
> Atoms and molecules constitute matter. However if there are insufficient amounts of atoms and molecules there isn't matter. That is the case with the vacuum of outer space.

AND. LOL, that IS THE CASE at the 'sub-atomic level' of things AS WELL as within the structure of a 'table' ALSO.

ONCE MORE, the Universe, Itself, is, FUNDAMENTALLY, made up of two things. They are 'matter' AND 'space'.

The 'matter' word, here, obviously referring to 'material substance', while the 'space' word is just referring to the distance between and around 'matter', itself. The visible part of the Universe, that is; 'matter', being ALLOWED TO MOVE FREELY because of the invisible part of the Universe, which is; 'space'.

There is ABSOLUTELY NOTHING HARD NOR COMPLEX TO COMPREHEND and UNDERSTAND, here.

BOTH 'matter' AND 'space' HAVE CO-EXISTED ALWAYS, and WILL FOREVER. And, because BOTH 'matter' and 'space' exist together 'NOW' this means, IRREFUTABLY, that they have BOTH CO-EXISTED ALWAYS. Which ALSO MEANS, IRREFUTABLY, the Life, Itself, and the Universe, Itself, ARE 'eternal' AS WELL AS 'infinite'.

Now, although the Universe, Itself, COULD exist either as:

'Infinitely compressed matter' with ABSOLUTELY NO 'space' within, NOR external to 'it', OR
An 'infiniteness of NO matter'.

But, as the Universe does NOT NOW exist in either of those forms this MEANS the Universe could NEVER have been one in one of those ways, which therefore MEANS that the Universe has ALWAYS consisted of BOTH 'matter' AND 'space', and thus has been ETERNALLY.

The Universe, although being able to EXIST in either form of 'ALL matter' OR 'ALL space'. ALL 'life', itself, NEEDS BOTH 'matter' AND 'space'. And, when there is 'matter' AND 'space' there IS 'Life', Itself. The two TOGETHER Create 'Life', which is WHY the Universe, Itself, IS ALIVE, and thus LIVING. Now, because both 'matter' AND 'space' have ALWAYS EXISTED, then so too has 'Life', Itself, ALWAYS EXISTED.

And, it is the Fact that the LIVING Universe is INFINITE in size, and has ALWAYS EXISTED, the reason WHY 'Existence', Itself, IS 'infinite' AND 'eternal', AS WELL.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Thu Jan 23, 2025 3:33 pm

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 11:09 pm
>
>> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 1:08 pm
>>
>>> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 5:47 am
>>> Some people also say and claim that 'an ocean' is made up of water, whereas they would NOT say and claim that 'space', itself, is made of water.
>>>
>>> Some people also say that 'an ocean' is NOT 'space' and say that 'space' is NOT 'an ocean'.
>>
>> Hence the terms physical space and immaterial space.
>
> Terms you SAY and USE, but WHEN you were QUESTIONED OVER those terms, of yours, you also CLAIMED that 'immaterial space' is actually composed of 'material', itself. Just less dense than, say, 'water'.
>
>> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 1:08 pm
>>
>>> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 5:47 am
>>> Although the so-called 'vacuum of outer space' is, here, considered 'immaterial', or what you call 'immaterial space', the 'vacuum of outer space', STILL, consists of matter, molecules and atoms, just what you call 'minimal', correct?
>>>
>>> …But, and just TO CLARIFY, there IS 'matter' in what you call the 'vacuum of outer space', right?
>>
>> Again, the vacuum of outer space does not involve matter in the terrestrial sense.
>
> OBVIOUSLY, and OF COURSE, HOWEVER you are ACTUALLY SAYING and STATING that what you CALLED 'vacuum of outer space', STILL, CONSISTS OF 'matter', itself, ANYWAY.
>
> So, what you have been ESSENTIALLY SAYING and MEANING, here, is 'your term', 'immaterial space' consists of ACTUAL 'material'.

The vacuum, as stated, is not material. There are insufficient atomic and molecular structures to form matter. There are only sparse atoms and molecules scattered around, too few to form even a gas.

The vacuum of outer space is predominantly comprised of quantum fluctuations, virtual particles and radiation.

Quantum fluctuations are not matter.

Virtual particles are not matter.

Radiation is not matter.

Those comprise the vacuum thus the vacuum is considered immaterial space.

There are so few molecules in the vacuum they are negligible.

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 11:09 pm
>
>> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 1:08 pm
>> Atoms and molecules constitute matter. However if there are insufficient amounts of atoms and molecules there isn't matter. That is the case with the vacuum of outer space.
>
> AND. LOL, that IS THE CASE at the 'sub-atomic level' of things AS WELL as within the structure of a 'table' ALSO.

Fair point.

As stated, immaterial space permeates existence:

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sun Dec 29, 2024 7:11 am
> Immaterial space, or immaterial expanse, permeates existence. Immateriality, not nothingness, is the contrast of materiality. Immaterial space has no matter or resistance allowing material bodies movement.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Age** » Thu Jan 23, 2025 11:39 pm

Age
Posts: 26385
Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 23, 2025 3:33 pm
>
>> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 11:09 pm
>>
>>> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jan 21, 2025 1:08 pm
>>>
>>> Hence the terms physical space and immaterial space.
>>
>> Terms you SAY and USE, but WHEN you were QUESTIONED OVER those terms, of yours, you also CLAIMED that 'immaterial space' is actually